

CLASSIFICATION OFFICE DECISION

Title of publication: The Great Replacement

Other known title(s): The Great Replacement Manifesto

OFLC ref: 1900149.000

Medium: Text File

Maker: Not stated

Country of origin: Aotearoa New Zealand

Language: English

Applicant: Chief Censor

Classification:	Objectionable.
------------------------	----------------

Descriptive note: None

Display conditions: None

Date of entry in Register: 29 March 2019

Date of direction to issue a label: No direction to issue a label has been issued

Date of notice of decision: 23 March 2019

Summary of reasons for decision:

The Chief Censor called this publication in for classification on 17 March 2019 under s 13(3) of the Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Act 1993 (FVPC Act). The Chief Censor, Deputy Chief Censor and a team of Senior Classification Advisors have examined the publication in its entirety and concluded that The Great Replacement is objectionable. In making this decision we have drawn on our considerable experience classifying previous terrorist promotional material. The publication is deemed objectionable under s 3(3)(d) of the FVPC Act due to the high extent and degree to which, and the manner in which it promotes and encourages crimes including murder and terrorism. Matters taken into consideration under s 3(4) (including the dominant effect of the publication, the intended audience, the purpose for which the publication is intended to be used and other relevant circumstances) also support this decision. In making this decision, the right to freedom of expression, that is to seek, receive, and impart information and opinions protected under s 14 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (NZBORA) was considered, together with the fact that under s 5 of the NZBORA this freedom is subject “only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society”. An objectionable classification for this publication is considered to be a demonstrably justified limit on that freedom in this case due to the high likelihood of injury to the public good from the publication's continued availability.